



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/784,699	02/23/2004	Jimbay P. Loh	1410/77058	1317
48940 7590 10/26/2007 FITCH EVEN TABIN & FLANNERY 120 S. LASALLE STREET SUITE 1600 CHICAGO, IL 60603-3406				
			EXAMINER WEINSTEIN, STEVEN L	
			ART UNIT 1794	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 10/26/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/784,699	Applicant(s) LOH ET AL.	
	Examiner Steven L. Weinstein	Art Unit 1794	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 August 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-90 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 49-89 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34, 40-46 and 90 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 35-39, 47 and 48 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>2/4/05, 8/1/05, and 5/10/07. and 10/4/06</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 1794

Upon reconsideration, the election of species set forth in the Office action mailed 6/13/07 is hereby withdrawn and an action on the merits of claims 1-48^{and 90} follows. }

Claims 35-39, 47 and 48 are objected as being improper dependent claims. As noted previously, claims 35-39, 47 and 48 do not recite the dependency of the claims in the alternative. Also, claim 47 is an improper claim since it does not further limit the claim from which it depends. A claim cannot recite "replacing" a limitation from a claim from which it depends.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-34, 40-46 and 90 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McIntyre et al (4,789,553) as further evidenced by Dameno et al (EP1338209), Holmes et al (EP 275717), Howard et al (EP 415,787), Tan (WO 98/52422), Hunter (4,539,212), Tonner et al (4,262,027), Brooks et al (3,886,296), Doster et al (4,597,976), Raffensberger (4,734,291), Barnes et al (5,599,573), and Oh (5,695,801), further in view of Kenji et al (JP 8-131065), Hoshizaki Electric Co. (JP 6-113718), Tanaka et al (JP9-187221), Hoshizaki Electric Co. (JP 10-262580), Hoshizaki et al (JP 11-137162), Hoshizaki Electric Co. (JP10-327833), Hoshizaki Electric Co. (JP10-262583), Nippon Sanso KK (JP 2000-60512), Hoshizaki Electric Co. (JP 2000-139374), Sanki Sangyo KK (JP 2000-312576), Numata (JP 7-274921), Cumakov et al

(EP 642824), Nisshin Flour Milling Co. (JP 6-113769), Okazaki (JP 4-108353), and Suzuki Ryuji (JP 1-196273).

Claims 1-48 are also rejected under 35 USC103(a) in reverse order, that is, as being unpatentable over Kenji et al (JP 8-131065), as further evidenced by Hoshizaki Electric Co. (JP 6-113718), Tanaka et al (JP9-187221), Hoshizaki Electric Co. (JP 10-262580), Hoshizaki et al (JP 11-137162), Hoshizaki Electric Co. (JP10-327833), Hoshizaki Electric Co. (JP10-262583), Nippon Sanso KK (JP 2000-60512), Hoshizaki Electric Co. (JP 2000-139374), Sanki Sangyo KK (JP 2000-312576), Numata (JP 7-274921), Cumakov et al (EP 642824), Nisshin Flour Milling Co. (JP 6-113769), Okazaki (JP 4-108353), and Suzuki Ryuji (JP 1-196273), further in view of McIntyre et al (4,789,553) as further evidenced by Dameno et al (EP1338209), Holmes et al (EP 275717), Howard et al (EP 415,787), Tan (WO 98/52422), Hunter (4,539,212), Tonner et al (4,262,027), Brooks et al (3,886,296), Doster et al (4,597,976), Raffensberger (4,734,291), Barnes et al (5,599,573), and Oh (5,695,801).

In regard to claim 1, McIntyre et al discloses a method for acidifying a food product comprising contacting the food product with an edible acidic solution effective for lowering the pH of the final product to less than or equal to 4.6. McIntyre et al discloses that by reducing the pH of the food product to the recited pH, the food product can then be given a heat preservation step under much milder conditions than if the pH had not been reduced. This is because lowering the pH of the food product into the acidic range has an antibacterial effect, which also makes bacteria more susceptible to lower temperatures. This is applicants' reason for lowering the pH as well. Dameno et al

Art Unit: 1794

(EP1338209), Holmes et al (EP 275717), Howard et al (EP 415,787), Tan (WO 98/52422), Hunter (4,539,212), Tonner et al (4,262,027), Brooks et al (3,886,296), Doster et al (4,597,976), Raffensberger (4,734,291), Barnes et al (5,599,573), and Oh (5,695,801) are all relied on as further evidence that it was notoriously conventional to introduce an agent that lowers the pH of a food product, for preservation purposes. Claim 1 differs from McIntyre et al, as further evidenced by the secondary art in that the pH reducing agent is an electrodialyzed composition. As disclosed, the specification appears to be vague as to what this composition actually is, but reading between the lines, it would appear that the composition is what is termed in the art "acidified water" (which is made by an electrolysis process using membranes). Thus, the acidified water when associated with the food product, lowers the pH of the food product. As evidenced by Kenji et al (JP 8-131065), Hoshizaki Electric Co. (JP 6-113718), Tanaka et al (JP9-187221), Hoshizaki Electric Co. (JP 10-262580), Hoshizaki et al (JP 11-137162), Hoshizaki Electric Co. (JP10-327833), Hoshizaki Electric Co. (JP10-262583), Nippon Sanso KK (JP 2000-60512), Hoshizaki Electric Co. (JP 2000-139374), Sanki Sangyo KK (JP 2000-312576), Numata (JP 7-274921), Cumakov et al (EP 642824), Nisshin Flour Milling Co. (JP 6-113769), Okazaki (JP 4-108353), and Suzuki Ryuji (JP 1-196273), just as it was notoriously conventional to lower the pH of food products with an acid as an acidifying agent, it was also notoriously conventional to expose food products to acidified water to lower the pH of food products for a number of reasons, including preservation. To modify McIntyre et al as further evidenced by the secondary art and substitute one conventional pH reducing agent for another conventional pH reducing

Art Unit: 1794

agent would therefore have been obvious, i.e., for its art recognized and applicants' intended function would therefore have been obvious. There is no unexpected result. The acidified water is known to lower pH, and then once the pH is lowered, benefits result in terms of the reduction in heat preservation conditions as well as other benefits. Note, too, that the art taken as a whole (e.g. Cumakov et al) discloses that both acidified water as well as alkaline water, both produced through electrodialysis, can have positive preservation effects. Also, although Suzuki Ryuji specifically discloses alkaline water in a preservation method, Suzuki Ryuji nevertheless recognizes that by using treated water as a pH changing agent, pH changing agents such as alkaline chemical additives can be avoided, thus preventing undesirable side effects, which is applicants' goal as well. In regard to the specifically recited ion concentrations and chlorine concentration, once it was known in the art to acidify water so that it can be used in a food pH reducing process, the particular ion concentrations of the composition is seen to either have been inherent or an obvious result effective variable. In regard to the dependent claims and the other independent claims, these claims recite food compositions, which are conventionally acidified for preservation purposes, and food processing steps that are conventionally employed in food preservation. As evidenced by McIntyre et al (4,789,553), and further evidenced by Dameno et al (EP1338209), Holmes et al (EP 275717), Howard et al (EP 415,787), Tan (WO 98/52422), Hunter (4,539,212), Tonner et al (4,262,027), Brooks et al (3,886,296), Doster et al (4,597,976), Raffensberger (4,734,291), Barnes et al (5,599,573), and Oh (5,695,801), it was well established to reduce the pH of food products such as vegetables, meats, pastas (either in dry or

dough form) etc., especially, so that milder heat preservation conditions can be employed. The art taken as a whole also discloses that it was, of course, conventional to employ heat preservation either after packaging or before packaging, such as part of an aseptic, hot fill process, and it was also conventional to associate the acidifying agent with the food product either before packaging or after packaging the food product in a package. The particular process variables are also taught by the art taken as a whole.

In regard to the second ground of rejection, since Kenji et al (JP 8-131065) as further evidenced by the secondary art, teaches it was well established to employ acidified water in a food processing method, including food preservation, wherein it is desired to reduce the pH, to modify the combination and employ an otherwise conventional food preservation process which can include reducing the pH of the food, reducing the pH before or after packaging, hot filling or post packaging heating, etc., would have been obvious in view of McIntyre et al (4,789,553), as further evidenced by Dameno et al (EP1338209), Holmes et al (EP 275717), Howard et al (EP 415,787), Tan (WO 98/52422), Hunter (4,539,212), Tonner et al (4,262,027), Brooks et al (3,886,296), Doster et al (4,597,976), Raffensberger (4,734,291), Barnes et al (5,599,573), and Oh (5,695,801).

As noted previously, to expedite prosecution, in view of the plethora of references cited by applicant, and in view of the fact that none of the references were discussed in the specification in a background section of the specification, nor any admissions of prior art were made, and in an effort to avoid any key reference from

Art Unit: 1794

being overlooked in such a large stack of references, especially since the various prior art, both U.S. and foreign, appear to use different terminology for similar processes, applicant is invited to point out which references are directed to associating electrodialed water with food products, which water is capable of lowering the pH of the food products, whether or not the particular process is directed to a preservation process.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Steven L. Weinstein whose telephone number is 571-272-1410. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7:00 A.M.-2:30 P.M..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Milton Cano can be reached on 571-272-1398. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Steve Weinstein
STEVE WEINSTEIN
PRIMARY EXAMINER 1794